arXiv:physics/0612089v2 [physics.optics] 29 Dec 2009

Comment on "a subwavelength optical lattice"

V.A. Kuz'menko[1]

Troitsk Institute for Innovation and Fusion Research,
Troitsk, Moscow region, 142190, Russian Federation.

Abstract

T. Salger et al. in the e-prints arXiv:cond-mat/0512018, 0711.1772 and 0912.0102 study a cold atoms motion in a so-called subwavelength scale optical lattice. However, their explanation of the experimental results is wrong. But the studied experimental conditions, which are based on a multiphoton Raman transitions in a nondegenerated ground states, quite suit for experimental study of inequality of forward and reversed processes in optics.

PACS numbers: 03.75.Lm, 37.10.-x, 42.50.Vk

Some of the theorists believe that a physical theory must not explain a physical nature of the phenomenon. It should only describe and predict the experimental results. But it is difficult to agree with such position: a physical theory in this case looks like as an astrology. However, from other side such opinion is rather exact characteristic of the place and role of the number of present day physical theories in the field of quantum physics. They can well describe the phenomena, but can not give any clear physical explanation of its nature.

The most old and illustrative example of such kind is the famous Bloch equations and corresponding rotating wave approximation model [1]. This model gives beautiful description of the dynamics of optical transitions in a two-level quantum system. But it is useless to ask why instead of the usual Rabi oscillations the sweeping of the resonance conditions leads to complete population transfer from the initial to the end level. The model well describes this process, but can not explain it.

Other example is the description of a dynamics of a cold atom motion in a so-called optical lattice. It is supposed, that due to of atom's polarizability some potential barriers exist there. Appropriate mathematical models quite successfully describe the dynamics of a cold atoms motion in optical lattice [2-4]. However, the main problem here is that the amplitude of atom's oscillations can greatly exceeds the spatial periodicity of the supposed trapping potential [5]. This is physically meaningless result. And what is more, we do not have any reliable experimental proofs of the existence of the potential barriers in optical lattice [6]. It means that the concept of the potential barriers is erroneous. This is a myth.

From our point of view the discussed articles [7-9] are good example of illustration and extension of this myth. The proposed explanation is based

---

[1] Electronic address: kuzmenko@triniti.ru

on the assumption that very small change in some of lattice wavelengths can produce a subwavelength optical lattice having period $\lambda/(2\text{n})$, where $n > 2$. However, we do not need in so subtle and unnatural assumption. We have clear alternative explanation: the motion of cold atoms in an optical trap is determined not by the potential barriers, but by the asymmetry of forward and reversed Raman transitions [5]. The basic concept of inequality of forward and reversed processes in quantum physics has some direct and great number of indirect experimental proofs. For explanation of the phenomena in an optical lattice we do not need in any anti-intuitive assumptions. The amplitude of the Bloch oscillations in the vertical optical lattice depends from the gravitation and the photon recoil energy and does not restricted by the lattice period [5].

At low intensity of laser radiation a fully reversed Raman transitions prevail for which a large amplitude oscillations correspond. This regime usually is called as a superfluid regime [4]. At high intensity of laser radiation a so-called partially reversed Raman transitions begin playing an important role [10]. In this case the amplitude of oscillations may be smaller than the radiation wavelength. It corresponds to the so-called Mott-insulator regime. So, the important task now is the experimental determination of a ratio of differential cross-sections of forward, reversed and other kinds of the partially reversed transitions.

The discussed experiments [7-9] are interesting also because of they are a beautiful base for a study and determination of a ratio of cross-sections of the discussed above different kinds of a Raman transitions. An optical lattice is usually formed by two counterpropagating laser beams of equal wavelength. In this case the directed motion of cold atoms takes place as a result of a two-photon reversed Raman transition: the atom absorbs the photon from one beam and emits it in the other counterpropagating beam. The received recoil moment is preferentially directed towards the initial (marked) position of the atom in the space. This is also the main mechanism of an atom cooling in an optical trap.

In the experiments [7-9] one laser beam has frequency ω and the counterpropagating beam has two components with frequency $\omega + \Delta\omega$ and $\omega - \Delta\omega$, where the value of $\Delta\omega$ is equal to the nondegenerated ground states level's spacing of the atom. In this case the discussed above two-photon reversed Raman transition is impossible. However, the four-photon reversed Raman transition becomes quite possible and the authors observed it. This four-photon recoil process can be split on the two stages (in some sense it is similar to the experiments [11] from the quite different field of research). The first stage is the forward or partially reversed two-photon Raman transition in the new additional quantum state. The second stage is the fully reversed two-photon Raman transition into the initial state. Changing the intensity of the different components $\omega + \Delta\omega$ and $\omega - \Delta\omega$, we can extract the information about relative efficiency (cross-sections) of this two stages of four-photon Raman processes. This two stages may be split in time and studied independently. It is also interesting to study a phase dependences of this two stages [12].

In conclusion, the discussed experiments are quite simple and the experimentalists need only in a little understanding of a physical nature of the studied phenomenon.

References

[1] L. Allen and J.H. Eberly, *Optical Resonance and Two-Level Atoms*, N.Y., John Wiley and Sons, (1975)

[2] F. Dalfovo, S. Giorgini, L. Pitaevskii, and S. Stringari, e-print, arXiv:cond-mat/9806038

[3] A.R. Kolovsky and H.J. Korsch, e-print, arXiv:cond-mat/0403205

[4] I. Bloch, J. Dalibard, and W. Zwerger, e-print, arXiv:0704.3011

[5] V.A. Kuz'menko, e-print, arXiv:physics/0609120

[6] V.A. Kuz'menko, e-print, arXiv:0712.2978v3

[7] G. Ritt, C. Geckeler, T. Salger, G. Cennini, and M. Weitz, e-print, arXiv:cond-mat/0512018

[8] T. Salger, G. Ritt, C. Geckeler, S. Kling, and M. Weitz, e-print, arXiv:0711.1772

[9] T. Salger, S. Kling, T. Hecking, C. Geckeler, L. Morales-Molina, and M. Weitz, e-print, arXiv:0912.0102

[10] V.A. Kuz'menko, e-print, arXiv:physics/0612089v1

[11] M.C. Stowe, A. Pe'er and J. Ye, e-print, arXiv:0801.4796

[12] V.A. Kuz'menko, e-print, arXiv:0711.1501v5